UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,038	12/30/2003	Edward John Giblin	C6656(C)	6775
201 7590 10/01/2007 UNILEVER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP 700 SYLVAN AVENUE,			EXAMINER	
			DERAKSHANI, PHILIPPE	
BLDG C2 SOUTH ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100		100	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	·	•	3754	
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		₩
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/748,038	GIBLIN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	PHILIPPE S. DERAKSHANI	3754
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 3 2a) □ This action is FINAL. 2b) ⊠ This 3) □ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under the second seco	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers	•	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	its have been received. Its have been received in Applica prity documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Application/Control Number: 10/748,038

Art Unit: 3754

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims and 1-2, 5, 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulovich et al 6,523,724 in view of Kurita et al 6,277,478.

Paulovich et al show a venting closure comprising a neck 166, patch 58 having an off center aperture 410 and backing layer 420. Paulovich et al lack the patch adhered to the neck and a backing layer adhered to the patch. Kurita et al show a patch closure comprising a patch 10 adhered to a neck 22 and a backing layer 9 adhered to the patch. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have substituted the Paulovich et al closure having the patch adhered to the neck and a backing layer adhered to the patch as taught by Kurita et al as an alternative equivalent means for applying a closure to a container neck.

Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulovich et al 6,523,724 in view of Kurita et al 6,277,478 as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Ostrowsky 3,993,208.

The Paulovich et al/ Kurita et al apparatus lacks the vent cap having a raised portion. Ostrowsky shows a cap having a raised portion 66 to point to the pressure surface areas of the cap (column 3, lines 46-50). It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3754

ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Paulovich et al Kurita et al I apparatus cap with a raised portion as taught by Ostrowsky to point to the pressure surface areas of the cap.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/19/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 5 and 8-13 are most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

In response to Applicant's argument that Ostrowsky is used for different purpose then applicants invention, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ou-Yang is cited to show another example of a backing layer. Dimeo et al is cited to show another example of a cap having an arrow indicator.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIPPE S. DERAKSHANI whose telephone number is 571-272-4925. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hour days.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P. Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/748,038 Page 4

Art Unit: 3754

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PHILIPPE S DERAKSHANI

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3754

PD 9/25/07